



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,873	03/19/2004	Richard Gerard Hofmann	RPS920030153US1	7650
48878	7590	05/30/2006	EXAMINER	
VAN LEEUWEN & VAN LEEUWEN			RAY, GOPAL C	
P.O. BOX 90609			ART UNIT	
AUSTIN, TX 78709-0609			PAPER NUMBER	
			2111	

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/804,873	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HOFMANN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Gopal C. Ray	<b>Art Unit</b> 2111	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Gopal C. Ray (USPTO). (3) \_\_\_\_.
- (2) Mr. Scott Schmok (Reg. # 51,076). (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 22 May 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3 and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent 6,981,071.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*Gopal C. Ray*

**GOPAL C. RAY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2800**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the proposed agenda for the telephone interview FAX'ed to the examiner on 5/16/06 and also 5/18/06 including Applicant Initiated Interview Request on PTOL-413A. Applicant's representative, Mr. Schmok explained the claimed invention specifically claimed in independent claim 1. Mr. Schmok explained that the interrupt request for a data transfer was forwarded to the destination device after the completion of the same data transfer. However, the examiner believes that the broadest interpretation of all the above claims reads on the above prior art. For example, as to claim 1, it appears that the pending interrupt request has been forwarded to the destination device in response to the completion of the previous data transfer which is well known and expected in the data processing art for reliability. Applicant will amend the claims exercising the inventive concept over the prior art of record, alone or in combination.

Scott A. Schmok  
Patent Agent

105 Saddletree Lane  
Dripping Springs, TX 78620

Phone: 512-264-0314  
Fax: 512-264-3462  
scottschmok@austin.rr.com

# Fax

**To:** Examiner Ray

**From:** Scott Schmok

**Fax:** 571-273-3631

**Pages:** 2

**Phone:** 571-272-3631

**Date:** May 16, 2006

**Re:** Telephonic Interview Agenda

**CC:**

☐ Urgent    ☐ For Review    ☐ Please Comment    ☐ Please Reply    ☐ Please Recycle

---

◆ **Comments:**

Examiner Ray, attached is a proposed agenda for our telephonic interview to discuss application **10/804,873**.

Regards,

Scott Schmok

Reg. No. 51,076

**Agenda for Telephonic Interview  
Application 10/804,873**

**I. High-Level Discussion of Applicants' Invention**

- Applicants' invention forwards an interrupt request to a destination device, which was received from a source device, after data has completed transferring to the destination device.

**II. High-Level Discussion of Wang**

- Wang discloses a method of selecting a configuration mode from a plurality of modes to transfer data from a source device to a destination device.

**III. Claim Discussion**

- **Claim 1:** Applicants forward the interrupt request, which was received from the source device, to a destination device. Wang does not forward the interrupt request, but rather generates an interrupt request (col. 13, lines 3-5) and sends the interrupt request to a controller to clear signals instead of the destination device as claimed by Applicants (col. 26, lines 23-29).
- **Claims 2 & 3:** Applicants store data, a source device ID, and a destination device address in a single data queue (refer to Applicants' Figure 2, element 210). The Office Action cites excerpts in Wang, which do not show these limitations, but rather show:
  - **Figure 4, element 36:** the destination device itself, which would not store the source device ID and the destination device address.
  - **Col. 6, lines 55-56:** Discloses a device buffer interface unit.
  - **Col. 13, lines 9-11:** Discloses signal generation.
  - **Figure 11, element 198a:** Shows an address generator.
- **Claim 6:** Applicants store the interrupt, a source device ID, and a destination device address in a single interrupt queue (refer to Applicants' Figure 2, element 215). The Office Action uses the same argument to reject claim 6 that it uses to reject claim 3, which is discussed above. Again, Wang does not disclose such limitations to store the interrupt, a source device ID, and a destination device address in a single interrupt queue as claimed by Applicants.

**Scott A. Schmok**  
Patent Agent

105 Saddletree Lane  
Dripping Springs, TX 78620

Phone: 512-264-0314  
Fax: 512-264-3462  
scottschmok@austin.rr.com

# Fax

**To:** Examiner Ray

**From:** Scott Schmok

**Fax:** 571-273-3631

**Pages:** 3

**Phone:** 571-272-3631

**Date:** May 18, 2006

**Re:** Telephonic Interview Agenda

**CC:**

☐ **Urgent**    ☐ **For Review**    ☐ **Please Comment**    ☐ **Please Reply**    ☐ **Please Recycle**

● **Comments:**

Examiner Ray, attached is an applicant initiated interview request form and a proposed agenda for our telephonic interview to discuss application **10/804,873**.

Regards,

Scott Schmok

Reg. No. 51,076

PTOL-413A (09-04)  
Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/804,873 First Named Applicant: Hotmann  
Examiner: RAY Art Unit: 2111 Status of Application: 1st Action Final

### Tentative Participants:

(1) Scott Schmok (2) Examiner Ray  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: 5/22/06 Proposed Time: 11:00 (AM/PM) EST

### Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO  
If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

## Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej</u>	<u>1</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>Rej</u>	<u>2/3</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) <u>Rej</u>	<u>6</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: (See attached)  
claim 2 - Applicant's forward on I.R.Q., P/A generates  
claim 2/3 - Applicant's store data, source device ID + dest. device addr.  
claim 6 - Apps. store items in an interrupt queue.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.  
**NOTE:** This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Scott Schmok

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

51076

Registration Number, if applicable

Gopal C. Ray  
Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.*



## Agenda for Telephonic Interview Application 10/804,873

### I. High-Level Discussion of Applicants' Invention

- Applicants' invention forwards an interrupt request to a destination device, which was received from a source device, after data has completed transferring to the destination device.

### II. High-Level Discussion of Wang

- Wang discloses a method of selecting a configuration mode from a plurality of modes to transfer data from a source device to a destination device.

### III. Claim Discussion

- **Claim 1:** Applicants forward the interrupt request, which was received from the source device, to a destination device. Wang does not forward the interrupt request, but rather generates an interrupt request (col. 13, lines 3-5) and sends the interrupt request to a controller to clear signals instead of the destination device as claimed by Applicants (col. 26, lines 23-29).
- **Claims 2 & 3:** Applicants store data, a source device ID, and a destination device address in a single data queue (refer to Applicants' Figure 2, element 210). The Office Action cites excerpts in Wang, which do not show these limitations, but rather show:
  - **Figure 4, element 36:** the destination device itself, which would not store the source device ID and the destination device address.
  - **Col. 6, lines 55-56:** Discloses a device buffer interface unit.
  - **Col. 13, lines 9-11:** Discloses signal generation.
  - **Figure 11, element 198a:** Shows an address generator.
- **Claim 6:** Applicants store the interrupt, a source device ID, and a destination device address in a single interrupt queue (refer to Applicants' Figure 2, element 215). The Office Action uses the same argument to reject claim 6 that it uses to reject claim 3, which is discussed above. Again, Wang does not disclose such limitations to store the interrupt, a source device ID, and a destination device address in a single interrupt queue as claimed by Applicants.